

---

# California Architects Board 2018 Environmental Scan

Prepared by Julie Kolaszewski  
SOLID Planning Solutions  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
November 2018



# Table of Contents

**TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 2**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 3**

**ACRONYM LEGEND ..... 4**

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES ..... 5**

**PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS ..... 6**

**PRACTICE STANDARDS ..... 8**

**ENFORCEMENT ..... 9**

*DCA Performance Measures Summary ..... 11*

**PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL AWARENESS ..... 12**

**ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS ..... 13**

**ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND CUSTOMER SERVICE ..... 14**

**APPENDIX A – STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS ..... 15**

**APPENDIX B – OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS ..... 43**

**APPENDIX C – DATA COLLECTION METHOD ..... 48**

## Introduction

One of the first steps in developing a Strategic Plan is to conduct a scan and analysis of the environment in which an organization operates. This analysis allows us to take a look at the factors that can impact an organization's success. These factors are evaluated quantitatively (via survey data) and qualitatively (via comments provided in surveys and interviews).

This document provides a summary assessment of the environmental scan recently conducted by SOLID for the California Architects Board (Board) beginning in October 2018. The purpose of this environmental scan is to provide a better understanding of thoughts and beliefs held by stakeholders, Board members, Board leadership (including the Executive Officer [EO]), and staff about the Board's performance within the following divisions/goal areas:

- ◆ Professional Qualifications
- ◆ Practice Standards
- ◆ Enforcement
- ◆ Public and Professional Awareness
- ◆ Organizational Relationships
- ◆ Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service

This document outlines areas where the Board's stakeholders, Board members, Board leadership, and staff are in agreement and disagreement while providing additional insight to assist the Board to develop goals and objectives in the upcoming Strategic Plan.

Please review this information carefully in preparation for the upcoming strategic planning session. At the planning session we will discuss and evaluate this information as a group to help identify new strategic objectives that the Board will focus on during the next Strategic Plan period.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Julie Kolaszewski with SOLID at (916) 574-8519 or [Julie.Kolaszewski@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Julie.Kolaszewski@dca.ca.gov).

## Acronym Legend

AG – Attorney General  
AIA – American Institute of Architects  
AIACC – American Institute of Architects, California Council  
ADA - Americans with Disabilities Act  
APL - Additional Pathway to Licensure  
ARE 5.0 – Architect Registration Examination (under NCARB)  
AXP – Architectural Experience Program  
BreZE – DCA’s online Licensing and Enforcement system  
BOMA – Building Owners Management Association  
BPC - Business & Professions Code  
CA - California  
CAB - California Architects Board  
CALBO – California Building Officials  
CCCCO - California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office  
CCIDC – California Council for Interior Design Certification  
CE - Continuing Education  
CSE – California Supplemental Examination  
CSLB – Contractors State License Board  
DCA – Department of Consumer Affairs  
EO – Executive Officer  
IDP – Internship Development Program  
IPAL – Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure  
IT - Information Technology  
NAAB - National Architectural Accrediting Board  
NCARB – National Council of Architectural Registration Boards  
NGO - Non-Governmental Organization  
OA - Office Assistant  
OCM - Organizational Change Management  
OPES – Department of Consumer Affairs’ Office of Professional Examination Services  
SF - San Francisco  
SME – Subject Matter Expert  
SoCal - Southern California

## Strengths and Weaknesses

The following is an assessment of strengths and weaknesses for each of the Board's goal areas as provided through comments and quantitative ratings. Comments are summarized for an aggregated perspective of how external stakeholders, Board members, Board leadership, and Board staff perceive the effectiveness of each goal area. Refer to Appendix A for a complete list of comments.

## Professional Qualifications

*The Board ensures the professional qualifications of those practicing architecture by setting requirements for education, experience, and examinations.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	33%	50%	100%	33%
Effective	60%	38%	0%	67%
Poor	7%	12%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

## Professional Qualifications Strengths

### High Standards

Stakeholders, Board leadership, and staff all agree that California has high standards when it comes to the requirements and knowledge that applicants must have in order to become licensed in the state. The standards require the correct mix of education and experience to sit for the exam.

### National and State Examinations

The California Supplemental Examination (CSE) is seen as a strength in that it covers advanced areas to ensure candidates are competent in skills that are specific to the state. Board members also remark that the new exam is focused on content and organized in a way that is in line with practical application in the field.

### Relationship with NCARB

Board members and stakeholders view the Board's relationship with NCARB as a strength, giving California a voice when decisions are being made at the national level. The positive relationship is also seen to be beneficial with the rollout of the new integrated path to architectural licensure (IPAL) program.

## Professional Qualifications Weaknesses

### **Continuing Education (CE)**

Staff and stakeholders view the verification of CE during non-renewal years to be minimal, allowing licensees to remain licensed without validating they are meeting the requirements. It was also noted that the current CE requirement is outdated and redundant with call to amend the area of focus.

### **Review of Requirements**

Board leadership and staff state that there may be a need for a review of requirements for education and experience to ensure the candidates are at the minimum level of competency to meet the current trends in the profession.

# Practice Standards

*The Board establishes regulatory standards of practice for California Architects.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	38%	45%	100%	47%
Effective	54%	22%	0%	53%
Poor	0%	33%	0%	0%
Very poor	8%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

## Practice Standards Strengths

### High Standards

Board members remark that the codes in California are very advanced and lead the nation. Board leadership agrees that the Board is proactive and forward thinking, looking for ways to enhance the practice.

### Clear Laws

All parties agree that the standards of practice are clearly written and easy for licensees to understand, making it easy for architects to abide by the rules in the state.

## Practice Standards Weaknesses

### Architects Practice Act

Stakeholders assert that the Practice Act is too broad and that the Board shifts focus based on trends related to the practice. Board members state that the Board is out of sync with the national standards, which causes confusion for licensees who are following two different sets of rules.

### Outdated Regulations

Staff note that there are outdated regulations that should be updated to be more clear and reflect current licensing requirements, while Board members also state that the current CE requirement is outdated and should be reviewed to reflect current issues in the industry.

## Enforcement

*The Board protects consumers by preventing violations and effectively enforcing laws, codes, and standards when violations occur.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	14%	33%	50%	35%
Effective	79%	56%	50%	65%
Poor	0%	11%	0%	0%
Very poor	7%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

### Enforcement Strengths

#### Staff and Consultants

All parties agree that the staff and consultants are a strength for the Board. Staff and consultants are said to be knowledgeable and provide excellent analysis of cases.

#### Enforcement Timelines

The Board responds to all complaints in a timely manner with professionalism and good customer service.

#### Case Review

Stakeholders, Board members, and Board staff note that there is a fair review of enforcement cases and issues before any decisions are made and that the application of enforcement authority is in line with the violation and risk to public safety.

### Enforcement Weaknesses

#### Staffing

Board members and Board staff state that the Enforcement Unit is currently understaffed due to vacancies and has been for some time, which doesn't allow for the Board to be as efficient as possible in handling complaints and has also caused a delay in resolving cases.

**Consumer Protection**

Board members note that there is unlicensed activity in the industry that goes undetected, posing a threat to consumer safety. Stakeholders and staff also include that the penalties and fines may not be strong enough to deter unlicensed activity in the field posing a risk for consumers as well. It was also suggested that more efforts towards consumer education may help in protecting people from being the target of unlicensed practitioners.

## DCA Performance Measures Summary

The performance measures demonstrate the Board is making the most efficient and effective use of resources. Performance measures are linked directly to a Board’s mission, vision, strategic objectives, and strategic initiatives. The chart below shows the number of days between the stages of investigating a consumer complaint for the Board. The column labeled “target” is the goal the Board has established for itself. The remaining columns show the actual number of days to move a complaint from one step of the investigation process to the next.

### *Glossary of Performance Measure Terms*

**Volume** - Number of complaints received.

**Intake** - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to the date the complaint was assigned to an investigator.

**Intake & Investigation** - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to closure of the investigation process. Does not include cases sent to the Attorney General (AG) or other forms of formal discipline.

**Formal Discipline** - Average number of days to complete the entire enforcement process for cases resulting in formal discipline. (Includes intake and investigation by the Board and prosecution by the AG.)

**Probation Intake** - Average number of days from monitor assignment to the date the monitor makes first contact with the probationer.

**Probation Violation Response** - Average number of days from the date a violation of probation is reported, to the date the assigned monitor initiates appropriate action.

Performance Measure	Target	Q2 October –	Q1 July –
		December 2017	September 2017
Volume (number of complaints)	---	106	91
Intake (days)	7	1	1
Intake & Investigation (days)	270	66	106
Formal Discipline (days)	540	1382	450
Probation Intake (days)	5	1	n/a
Probation Violation Response (days)	15	n/a	n/a

## Public and Professional Awareness

*The Board increases public and professional awareness of the Board’s mission, activities, and services.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	8%	0%	0%	19%
Effective	62%	33%	100%	50%
Poor	30%	67%	0%	31%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

### Public and Professional Awareness Strengths

#### Outreach Efforts

All parties agree that the Board is making strong efforts to increase outreach and improve awareness to licensees and consumers. The Board has a Communications Committee dedicated to the efforts, engaging with schools, related professions, and industry organizations. Additionally, the Board provides a newsletter, is active on social media, and has an easy to navigate website with information available to all stakeholders.

### Public and Professional Awareness Weaknesses

#### Public Outreach

Board members, Board leadership, and staff point to the need for more communication geared toward the educating the public of the Board’s existence.

#### More Outreach Needed

Stakeholders call for additional outreach to the industry, specifically to building officials and allied professions that interact with architects. Board leadership and Board members suggest increasing the usage of technology in order to be more proactive in the outreach efforts, targeting consumers and expanding the outreach to schools and local governments.

## Organizational Relationships

*The Board improves effectiveness of relationships with related organizations in order to further the Board's mission and goals.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	0%	33%	100%	29%
Effective	69%	67%	0%	64%
Poor	23%	0%	0%	7%
Very poor	8%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

### Organizational Relationships Strengths

#### Positive Relationships

All parties agree that the Board has established positive relationships with many profession-related organizations and schools. In particular, it is viewed that the Board has a strong and collaborative relationship with NCARB and that AIA consistently attends Board meetings. It was noted that there is good communication with related organizations and the schools as well.

### Organizational Relationships Weaknesses

#### Limited Focus

There is agreement among all parties that there is a limited focus on building relationships with specific organizations, such as NCARB, and that the Board could expand its focus to include other boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs, other professional associations and collateral organizations, and schools. It was suggested that hosting Board meetings at colleges and universities would be beneficial in strengthening these relationships and creating more awareness.

# Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service

*The Board enhances organizational effectiveness and improves the quality of customer service in all programs.*

<u>Rating</u>	<u>External Stakeholders</u>	<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Board Leadership</u>	<u>Board Staff</u>
Very effective	17%	56%	50%	31%
Effective	67%	44%	50%	63%
Poor	16%	0%	0%	6%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

## Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Strengths

### Good Customer Service

All parties are in agreement that the Board is customer-oriented and delivers excellent customer service. Questions are promptly answered, and staff are viewed as being available and approachable.

### Staff and Leadership

The Board has tenured staff that are very clear in their roles and responsibilities. Staff are viewed as professional, friendly, and very knowledgeable. Staff report that the units work collaboratively, and that cross-training has allowed for a continuity in business when one team member is absent.

## Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Weaknesses

### Technology

There is a continued call for improved technology to better address customer service and internal processing needs. The availability of online capabilities, such as payments, remains an obstacle with the transition to the Department's BreZE system or another platform still unknown.

### Staffing and Leadership

There has been turnover in staff at the Board, specifically in the Enforcement Unit, creating inefficiencies during the hiring and onboarding process. There is also a call for improved communication within the Board and a more efficient approach to addressing matters from Board leadership.

## Appendix A – Stakeholder Comments

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to the Board’s strengths and weaknesses collected during the stakeholder survey, Board leadership and Board staff focus groups, and Board member interviews.

*The comments in this appendix are shown as provided to SOLID. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. Comments that were repeated multiple times are grouped with the amount shown in parentheses. Some comments may have been edited for grammar or punctuation; however, edits to the comments have not changed the meaning the messenger intended when providing the comment.*

## **Stakeholders: Professional Qualifications Strengths**

### **Balanced**

1. In the past, the Board's efforts to balance issues of importance to practice and consumer protection have been superb.

### **Efforts**

1. Outreach; visibility; creativity in addressing issues related to licensure and training.

### **External Relationships**

1. Supporting NCARB, ARE and AXP for reciprocity.

### **Standards**

1. Having been involved as an architect on several examinations for the Board, I have first hand observed the strength of the Board in their pursuit of excellent standards and professional examinations.
2. Knowledge of profession

### **Supplemental Exam**

1. Continued supplemental examination administration.
2. An effective CSE

## **Board Members: Professional Qualifications Strengths**

### **Board Staff and Board Committee**

1. We have Board members that are architects, so they bring that background and experience to the Board.
2. The Board has a Professional Qualification Committee, it's a very active committee that is constantly visiting pressing and current issues, informs the full Board of necessary action required. Licensure handbook, we are making recommendations for some meaningful improvement of the new draft/edition and we will bring the revised edition to the full Board for review and adoption.
3. We can be looking at strengths to develop now.
4. In terms of the Board, there's a great interest in facilitating the qualification process without weakening the standardization process.
5. The architects that sit on the Board are definitely not just empty seats, they are very involved and have something to say every time an issue comes up, which is very exciting.

### **Relationship with Other Organizations**

1. Our relationship with NCARB so that California has a voice at the table when they are making policy decisions regarding the qualifications.
2. We work actively with NCARB in supporting and promoting the alternative paths for licensure to ensure the profession is well supported down the road.

3. Ties to NCARB so we can make sure they don't go in a different direction than what we think is best as far as guidelines and standards.
4. We have a good working relationship with the examination providers. What they're doing allows us to see the process.
5. We are very vocal when we see something that isn't working, we hold the schools' feet to the fire so they ensure teachers are teaching the right things and that students pass the exam on the first try.

### **Examinations**

1. We are also paying attention to how California candidates are doing in terms of abilities and performance on the national exam. We do this nearly every Board meeting, we want to see the trends and if there's anything the Board needs to act on, by constantly monitoring the trends we are helping the state to prevent any professional continuity issues.
2. California is very advanced in a lot of areas, earthquake and environmental issues, so we have the supplemental exam to ensure competency of candidates.
3. It starts with the fact the CA requires a supplemental exam, once you go through the ARE you don't get licensed in CA until you take the CSE, thereby ensuring that however practices in CA has specific knowledge of what the practice is like here (we are very green and the seismic aspect). (2)
4. The new exam is really organized around the five basic parts that architects have in their contract and how they approach projects. This is great. It falls logically in line with how we work projects.
5. We work with NCARB on the exam; through a couple of our members, the Board seems to be well connected with NCARB.

### **Pathways to Licensure**

1. Changing position – something going on with the accelerated path for licensure.
2. This new experimenting path with USC has the potential to be good to 1) shorten the period in a little over 6 years vs. 11 years.
3. The strength is getting students into internships earlier.

## **Board Leadership: Professional Qualifications Strengths**

### **Strong Qualifications**

1. Because the qualifications have been in existence for quite some time they must be strong because it hasn't really shown any problems with it, we've been fine tuning, it doesn't need a major overhaul, it's pretty solid for what it is right now. Integrated pathway is still new but I think it's going to show some real benefits and prove very effective.

### **Continuous Review of Qualifications.**

1. It's helpful that the Board continually looks at the different pathways to licensure and how long it can take candidates to get licensed. We are always looking at ways to streamline and make it more user friendly.

## **Staff: Professional Qualifications Strengths**

### **Pathways to Licensure**

1. The flexibility in the paths available for candidates to receive a license.
2. The Board provides a very broad way for candidates to become licensed in California and has multiple resources for candidates on its website.
3. Clearly states the requirements for education, experience, and examination in regulation and on websites. Has accepted and advocated for new methods of meeting requirements, such as IPAL.

### **Standards**

1. Competitive process to obtaining a license. Ensures architects have the education and experience in order for them to qualify for taking the exams.
2. Adequate education and experience prerequisites to licensure

### **Verification**

1. The Board requires an original signature of the employer verifying experience, dates (timeframes) full-time, part time, etc., and verifies employer licensed status.

### **Board Members**

1. The Board is comprised of members who are willing to consider efficiencies in the licensure process.

## **Stakeholders: Professional Qualifications Weaknesses**

### **New Pathways for Licensure**

1. To some of us in academia, the recent CAB move to change eligibility for sitting for the ARE caught us by surprise. It has had a substantial impact on the IPAL schools.

### **Political**

1. Lately, it appears that politics have seeped into the Board's efforts thereby throwing things into a more "regulatory" mindset.

### **Verification**

1. CE program takes a lot of resources
2. Knowledge of people confirming candidates' qualifications

### **Waiting Period**

1. Slow to notify candidates of qualifications to test and of CSE qualification to test.

### **General**

1. Required continuing education, a general weakening of supplemental exam content, over reliance on the AIA for input to the California licensure process.

## **Board Members: Professional Qualifications Weaknesses**

### **New Leadership**

1. There's a new EO, there will be a learning curve, we used to fall back to the EO who had a lot of experience.

### **Role of the Board and Board Members**

1. For anyone new to the Board, understanding the role of the Board and keeping the consumer top of mind vs. just the interest of architects. It can seem like a disadvantage for those who don't have the background knowledge of architecture and that can have an impact on our decision making.
2. We have some Board members that show up that are appointed that are not professionals that really don't participate, they don't show up to meetings or if they are there they don't engage in the meeting, they do other things and aren't focused on the CAB.

### **Exam**

1. It's important to know, in terms of graduating or licensed architects, I believe there's a high failure rate, how do we know what the right pass rate is to meet California's need and have enough licensed architects?
2. Exams are written in such a way that isn't as conducive to "architect language." This could be improved upon.
3. Some Board members feel that the exam proctors are not using a software program that students are used to/familiar with. However, this might not be a problem as some students don't seem to mind.
4. On the supplemental exam, there is no face-to-face contact with the candidate. It has turned into just another computer exam. I would like to see if there is some way to integrate into the supplemental exam that we can see the candidate and interact with the candidate.

### **Need Clarity**

1. Clarity is a weakness and following up on some initiatives that we kind of half started, community/public outreach.
2. Division between education and practice. The new program may help. Becoming more theoretical. Weakness is a lack of communication between the schools and practitioners.

Students have great opportunity in tech area, but their knowledge in the basics of architecture. Need to get back to practical application.

### **Continuing Education**

1. Some definition and amendment of the CE requirements for licensure.
2. The Board has been having a lot of discussions about the fact that there is this requirement for every two years, in order to keep your license, we have to take the continuing education but it's only one subject, which is ADA. #1 Do we need continuing education at all? There's discussion about having the benefit of additional CE or lack of benefit because AIA requires it for membership, which already sets people apart. Only having the one subject is a downside, I would rather have it include green construction, environmental, etc. So just having the one subject is the downside. I support CE actually.
3. CE requirements, right now we require that architects take the same CE year in and year out, it's legislated that way and that's all they are required to take. It seems very redundant and not very helpful to society.

### **Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL)**

1. IPAL, there are several architecture schools that have enrolled in the program, but there are concerns that we have not effectively addressed because it's beyond our scope, but we should be part of the solution. Now some schools feel that they are at a disadvantage for their students because their students might be interested and capable of participating in the program but the school is not a part of it. The IPAL shortens the process but when the school is not registered for the IPAL their students don't benefit from it. We don't have a lot of solutions because they are either enrolled or not enrolled and if not enrolled NCARB won't recognize.
2. Just getting IPAL involves schools and getting buy-in. There is emphasis and cooperation which is something we are still monitoring and wrestling with and adapting as needed to make it work. It goes against the ingrained thoughts of how things should be structured.
3. We want to get more people on the licensure track and licensed. We're looking at programs which allow for people to do internships while in school. The threat is to make sure that the candidates in the fast-track programs still have all the knowledge and skills they need to be licensed. We need to decide how we're going to ensure this.

### **Standards Design**

1. Design to 50% theory of how things go together. Other 50% technical aspects – systems integration and professional practice. The Board could encourage this. Be nice if there was a way where the Board was more in tune with schools even high schools to explain the profession and the needs.

## **Board Leadership: Professional Qualifications Weaknesses**

### **Requirement Review Needed**

1. We might need to look at the requirement for education and experience to make sure we are at the minimum level of competency for the profession right now.

## **Staff: Professional Qualifications Weaknesses**

### **Need for Updated Requirements**

1. The Board's requirements should be reassessed in light of trends in the profession and correspondingly updated.
2. Retaining the outdated requirements that may have been necessary once, but are no longer so.
3. The chart for evaluating candidate experience is outdated in some areas and should be updated to reflect current degree programs, practice, and work experience.

### **Requirement Verification**

1. In non-renewal years, the volume of CE audits are around 1-4 individuals per month - compared to the 30-60 in renewal years. A very small (3%+/-) minority of renewing individuals undergo this validation check.
2. The Board cannot see employer's (licensed architect) specific evaluation of older ARE candidates, since IDP/AXP is not required. Board can only rely on architect's signature for experience.

### **Training**

1. Lack of training

### **Unclear Laws**

1. CCR section 117 is difficult to read for most candidates (for example (b)(6) should be bullets). Due to the broadness scope of candidates, generally the examination score results are lower than what we see in states that only allow a degree from an accredited program.

### **Waiting Period**

1. Waiting period for exam retakes is too long.

## **Stakeholders: Practice Standards Strengths**

### **Good Efforts**

1. Again, participating as a volunteer for the Board, in various capacities, on exam and Board committees, I am aware of their efforts toward strong practice standards.
2. Used the OA to identify consumer protection issues; architect consultants are an effective resource.

### **Meets Expectations**

1. A common threshold for licensing
2. It "meets expectations."

## **Board Members: Practice Standards Strengths**

### **Board Representation**

1. We've got a good blend on the Board of architects who are cognizant of the difficulties in the practice but also consumer representatives that ensure that consumer protection is paramount, it's a good mix in terms of making decisions, regulations and even the ruling we do disciplinary-wise.
2. Now the Board has a very excellent working relationship with NCARB, we have worked side by side to ensure that we have standards that are not only high California standards, but also including those standards in the national exam as well. This helps California candidates to have an easier time getting their NCARB license as well.

### **High Standards**

1. I feel like CA does all these technical requirements very well. People who practice in CA are very well trained, it's very difficult to get licensed, many years of study and practicing in the profession.
2. As a companion to the practice law there's also the codes, the CA building codes are very advanced, so it helps our practice in CA always be on the leading edge of the country. I'm predicting the CA building code, basically a green code, is going to be adopted by other states as well. Architects have to be very mindful when designing here.
3. We did just readjust the contract language that architects have to have, certain parts were added to their written contract.
4. They're getting better and better. Practice standards are in a good spot. Need good mentors to the interns to make sure the interns understand the various aspects of the profession.

### **Good Exam**

1. New exams are much better coordinated and better.

### **Clear Standards**

1. The standards are clear by which architects can abide by.

### **Board Leadership: Practice Standards Strengths**

#### **Forward Thinking**

1. Partly because of the Board and the staff we are really forward thinking and proactive. We try to come up with things that maybe weren't heard of before, new ideas, then we vet it out and we end up with some good changes or enhancements. The forward thinking is very beneficial, especially with the Board members, they are very innovative and creative.

#### **Clear Standards**

1. We do a good job of establishing standards that licensees need to follow and trying to educate licensees and consumers on what architects can be doing and what consumers should expect and how they can contact the Board if there's a problem. The standards are clear.

### **Staff: Practice Standards Strengths**

#### **Clear Laws**

1. The laws are very clear to individuals the requirements in California.
2. Regulations are clear the requirements to practice. Website provides information to consumers and licensees that reflect regulation.

#### **Good Efforts**

1. I think this committee is making strives to become more efficient and provide resources to architects that are useful for reference and professional growth.

#### **In Line with National Standards**

1. The Board follows NCARB's national standards and policies and the Architect Practice Act.

### **Stakeholders: Practice Standards Weaknesses**

#### **Practice Act is Too Broad**

1. The definition of architect/architecture/practice is too broad to be accounted for on one platform.

#### **Board is Inconsistent**

1. The Board seems to trend toward the flavor of the day relative to practice (currently sustainability) without a strong direction in ethics, code knowledge, and holistic practice.

## **General**

1. Have allowed public owners to get around the QBS program by pre-qualifying and then asking for price.

## **Board Members: Practice Standards Weaknesses**

### **Continuing Education (CE)**

1. Our focus on CE is outdated. I think we should revitalize that and make it more relevant to the pressing issues of the current time, and the future. Issues like climate change adaptation and resiliency, it's a paramount for architecture to be at the forefront of this and how we advise our clients. With more wildfires and rising sea levels, we need to continue to focus on the content and subject of CE. The ADA shouldn't be a big deal anymore because it's required at every level of law, it's the day to day practice, it's less critical to health, safety, and welfare.

### **Out of Sync**

1. We need to get more in line with national standards, we are a little bit out of sync. When we don't have an alignment, it creates confusion for stakeholders with two sets of rules.
2. There are legal case law impacts on what the standards are that are out of our control (e.g., the duty of care). It's a challenge to get on the same page with those that have different perspectives on the rulings.

### **Regulated Un-licensed**

1. Sometimes we feel like we don't have enough teeth to do what we want for non-licensed people. For licensure, we have teeth in what we can do insofar as keep them from practicing; in unlicensed, we don't have that ability. We've yet to come up with a way to go after this.

### **Intern and Licensee Awareness**

1. Bring back the outside person that oversees interns. Because the outside people bring additional insight and help expand various areas of the professions. The Board needs to encourage students and new practitioners to get full picture of the profession.

### **New Testing Format**

1. We went digital when it comes to testing, in the past people would go to the test site and do things on paper, now we have a 5.0 testing standards that's done on computers so students have been learning on the paper, so now it will take students a couple of years to get used to using the new testing system.

## **Board Leadership: Practice Standards Weaknesses**

### **Educating Consumers**

1. It's a challenge for us to reach consumers so they can understand what the Board is here for and what they can expect from a licensed architect. There can be overlap with what an architect does, an engineer, and a contractor so helping to understand these things can be a challenge.

### **Board Mandate**

1. Always need to remind ourselves what our mandate is, to protect the consumer, sometimes we get off track a bit but we always come back to the consumer protection. So just to remind ourselves of our consumer protection mandate.

## **Staff: Practice Standards Weaknesses**

### **Outdated Regulations**

1. The regulations need to be updated so that the Board stays current with the practice.
2. Regulations need to be updated to reflect current licensing requirements and simplify language used for clarity.

## **Stakeholders: Enforcement Strengths**

### **Fair Review**

1. Asks how significant or widespread is a problem before coming up with regulation.

### **Good Focus**

1. The Board's efforts at focusing on the correct violators (unlicensed practice) and collections continues to improve.
2. Good metrics, focused on consumer protection

### **Staff**

1. Great staff and contracted architect consultants
2. Excellent staff/consultants

### **General**

1. No news is good news.

## **Board Members: Enforcement Strengths**

### **Staff and Staff Consultants**

1. We have good staffing in that area, although they are a bit understaffed as of late. We have good architect specialists on board who do a good job of analyzing these things.

2. Our staff is a strength, we have good consultants and we have staff that understands and responds to the concerns quickly.
3. I think we are doing a great job, based on the statistics that we get from staff, we only get the very severe cases where we have to challenge a license or put a license on watch. The staff takes care of most of it, they handle about 90% of everything before it gets to the Board. Staff is able to work with the licensees to straighten things about before it has to come to us.

### **Case Review**

1. We enforce- when there's a complaint against a licensed architect we take action to resolve the complaint.
2. The Board is actively investigating the violations, both ethic and professional competence.
3. The system of enforcement where we have the judge advocate reviews.
4. Some of them are a little bit on the capricious side- if someone is irate (a client) they will report you and you're not always guilty as charged but I do believe the CAB is pretty good at weeding out those illegitimate claims and focusing on the ones that are legitimate. The penalties are fair, not onerous, you're not committing a crime just not in line with professional standards.
5. While the claims are sometimes capricious we do weed them out and go through the hearing process and assess a penalty and it ends up being a pretty fair process but that does take a very long time. The number of days to complete the cases is reducing.

### **Clearly Defined**

1. The cases have all been very well explained to us and our standards are good.
2. The practice act is there so that architects know what they should be doing. Overall, we have it lined out very well. We have it outlined pretty well.
3. Audits are effective and frequent enough. Rate of people who are being caught is going down, audits may be helping bring attention to enforcement issues then reducing the recurrence.

### **Outreach**

1. We do try to do outreach to consumers, so they know when they haven't been dealt with properly according to the regulation.

## **Board Leadership: Enforcement Strengths**

### **Staff**

1. We're trying to strive forward with new staffing and try to carry the same standard and program efficiency with trying to transition with these new staff. It's been a team effort for the tenured staff in the program.

2. The enforcement staff are very thorough in their review of complaints and the cases we bring forward. We have architect consultants to help with enforcement and be experts to use as a resource for consumers is a strength.

## **Staff: Enforcement Strengths**

### **Fair**

1. Fee amounts are fair.
2. The application of enforcement authority appears to be appropriately proportional to the public harm.

### **Response to Complaints**

1. Enforcement delivers great customer service, intake complaints quickly and in a professional manner.
2. The Board is active in responding to complaints submitted by the public.
3. Pursues and responds to complaints in a timely manner.

### **Staff**

1. Excellent consultant analysis.

## **Stakeholders: Enforcement Weaknesses**

### **Weak Penalties**

1. Penalties/fines not severe enough. Legislation needed.
2. Case review appears to be under-supported for the number of practitioners in this state. Penalties for unlicensed practice also seems on the light side.

### **Limitations**

1. Complex enforcement limitations

### **Perception of Case Review**

1. Make an effort to prevent or at least prevent the perception that the Board is pursuing its own stakeholders/constituency (with CE violations) rather than those affecting consumer safety.

## **Board Members: Enforcement Weaknesses**

### **Unlicensed Architects**

1. The challenge is that when people have negative experience it's with people who are not licensed, and I don't know how we enforce that or how we go after them.
2. We see a number of enforcement issues. People calling themselves architects and they aren't. We spend a lot of time and money enforcing that aspect of enforcing people

calling themselves architects. Trying to get more knowledge in people hiring architects. Similar to contractors to get the public education get the public to verify architects' license.

3. Every two years licensees are supposed to renew their licenses but not everyone does that and we only do a random auditing process so some people get away with not renewing, and if they do ever get caught there really is no penalty to deter them from not renewing again in the future.

### **Staffing**

1. Staffing, being understaffed, even though we do outreach we have to figure out how to do more and better outreach, so consumers understand what they are entitled to from an architect provider.

### **Timeliness**

1. The length of time to complete an investigation and get through the entire process.

### **Collecting Fines**

1. We are still trying to find other ways to collect, being able to accept credit cards and maybe have a collection agency go after the bad debt, that might be already in play.
2. We fine people for things but we can't collect the fees because we don't have access to a driver's license or SSN. If you move we can't find you until you renew and then we are only looking 2 years back, there's no connection between collection and renewals.

### **Consumer Education**

1. We don't know the problems until someone comes forward and says that an architect didn't do well or is practicing without a license. I think we can be more proactive partnering with cities, counties, etc. to be our eyes and then distributing more outreach for consumer education. We need to be policing a bit better.
2. Problem is how we might better educate the public insofar as when to use an architect and what happens when you get a non-architect. Succinctly, we need to educate the public more about their consumer safety on the front-end and when they need to use a licensed professional.

### **Dishonest Licensees**

1. People who are licensed who are not being honest about their extended education. Seems to be issues with people not completing/ignoring they have to complete their CE. Licensees are saying they do CE but then in audit then have to pay fines. Seems to be improving. May want to go back to when you renew the license send in your CE certificate. Make a mandatory renewal up CE certificate. It was this way but then it's no longer.

### **Clarity**

1. We are falling short on our effectiveness in some cases. Would like to see improved clarity and position on what the Board is asked to do and how it administers its authority (i.e., in closed sessions, the Board seems to go off topic a lot, we need more focus and sort of a stricter following of the boundaries that we have authority in).

### **Suggested Objective**

1. CSLB now has the capability to put the picture on the license, we don't have that, so someone could show a consumer a license but they have no way to know if that's really who it is. We could at least put licensee pictures on the website when consumers go to do a license lookup.

## **Board Leadership: Enforcement Weaknesses**

### **Case Focus**

1. Right now quite a few of our citations on are on CE and failure to complete the education, it takes up resources so looking at how we balance our resources with regards to CE cases versus other types of complaints.

## **Staff: Enforcement Weaknesses**

### **Staffing**

1. The Enforcement Unit has been understaffed for some time. The workload has stacked up and the closure rate has decreased (more days taken to resolve cases).
2. The Board does not go after all enforcement issues even when it is known to Board staff, and there appears to be constant turnover among enforcement staff.
3. Understaffed, which may not allow the unit to be as efficient as it should be.

### **Weak Penalties**

1. Penalties should be increased to serve as a greater deterrent against unacceptable behavior/acts by architects and unlicensed individuals.

### **Internal Communication and Training**

1. Training to new enforcement staff.

## **Stakeholders: Public and Professional Awareness Strengths**

### **Outreach Efforts**

1. Outreach by contracted architects

### **Content Availability**

1. Available CAB web info is informative.
2. Good social media, especially Twitter. Publications are high quality (newsletter, Consumer Guide).

## **Board Members: Public and Professional Awareness Strengths**

### **Outreach**

1. We have an email newsletter, we have some presence on social media.
2. We get out and about a fair amount, with social media we are trying to get more people to access those things.
3. We put out the brochures on how to hire an architect, for the public, I know the staff tries to distribute those around disaster areas to the local building departments when the time is right.
4. We reach out to contractor associations and other associations to get our word out.
5. Our handbooks are good that we give building departments.

### **Awareness**

1. I think that the people who are going through the exam, either with NCARB or CSE process, that's when potential architects really touch the CAB, and I notice that people seem to understand it pretty well and can navigate the process/system pretty well. I don't hear of too many complaints, it's a sign that the message is getting out.
2. We're starting to do a good job in letting people know what we do. Consumers can get information if they are looking.

### **Effort**

1. The effort is a strength, but I don't think we are getting the results.
2. As Board members, we go out to talk to community colleges and colleges about education.

## **Board Leadership: Public and Professional Awareness Strengths**

### **Making Efforts to Expand Outreach**

1. The staff do a good job in terms of trying new things for outreach, working with Communications Committee at the Board, reach out to schools, work with CSLB, it's a focus for the staff and they are dedicated to it.
2. It's an interest of Board members to try and reach people we haven't been able to reach before, to increase diversity of licensing populations, targeting different groups, (e.g., high schools to get people interested and aware of the profession at an earlier stage).

3. We're always trying to improve our social media presence, we've recently expanded our social media platforms and we're always striving to be up to date with social media and to get the word out to our constituents as much as possible.

## **Staff: Public and Professional Awareness Strengths**

### **Content Availability**

1. Occasional outreach with NCARB. Website with relevant information.
2. Website is easy to use.

### **Outreach Efforts**

1. The Board provides information on its website, re-Tweets NCARB information, and posts changes to the profession in its newsletter.
2. The Board goes all out to promptly answer all inquiries by email and telephone. They reach out to candidates who are eligible through NCARB to instruct candidates how to apply. The Board also promotes instructions through several colleges that are interested.

## **Stakeholders: Public and Professional Awareness Weaknesses**

### **Industry Outreach**

1. Need more direct information and updates to building officials and staff.
2. In person public outreach to the profession and the allied professions including government agencies that interact with architects is very weak.
3. Infrequent reporting to the profession.
4. Newsletter needs to be more frequent. Could do more outreach.

### **General**

1. As I do not really know the extent of the Board's activities in this realm, I assume it could be a weakness.
2. Over reliance on social media and computerized tools in the Board's outreach. This non-personal approach really does seem to degrade the architectural profession in the role of client advocate, design arbiter and as a communicator of the profession.

### **Suggested Objectives**

1. Better communication through internet to code enforcement agencies.
2. I have been a member of one of the Board's committees for the past almost 3 years and there has never been a meeting held that I know of. It would be helpful if your constituents on the committees could meet regularly and have some direct introduction to and interaction with the Board members in their strategy goals. Strategic thinking happens at the top but it has to trickle down.
3. A closer relationship with the schools of architecture in the state is an opportunity to start interns thinking about eventual licensure.

4. Providing a better experience for those professionals who are interested to become licensed architects.

## **Board Members: Public and Professional Awareness Weaknesses**

### **Increase Outreach**

1. Educating the public, we could do a much better job of communicating and educating.
2. We can do better, the Board has been making an effort, we have Facebook and have modified the website since the past meeting. We are working on revising the licensing handbook, but we can do more. We try to protect the public, but they have very limited knowledge that the Board exists. Many architects, once licensed, don't think again about the Board.
3. We've got a limited social media platform, but I don't see that as a need. We don't have our BreEZe system or our all-encompassing website together, once we have something in place it will be easier for us to reach out to all of our stakeholders.
4. While we are out there talking to schools and deans of departments, let's add to the list that we also go talk to our local city/county departments and introduce ourselves and the Board's endeavors.
5. Look at other organizations/outlets to give our handbooks to. Help consumers understand the role and value of architects. Who else could we go to.
6. We don't advertise as much, we could be doing a better job. We are supposed to be partnering with the CSLB because they are doing a great job with getting out to consumers. With all the fires there is going to be an increased need for architects to help with the rebuilding process. We need to educate the public that when they hire someone that they have the qualifications needed.

### **Outreach Suggestions**

1. We could be using the social media a lot more, it's not a strength, it could be better utilized to share information. Staff says they don't have the bandwidth or funding to get information out or to do outreach, I would give social media greater priority. The Board needs constant reminders of who we are there to represent---are we representing consumers by ensuring we have quality licensed architects, looking about increasing the pool of architects, just protecting the public in general??? Sometimes we need to get back to our mission, having more clarity of what we are there to do.
2. The Board can be more active and take advantage of social media, or more advanced search engine optimization with google search. There could be centralized resources for communication and outreach at the department level, so not every board needs its own communication specific staff they can share people.
3. I would like to see more followers on social media. I would love to have one staff member (a new one) dedicated to social media/IT to send out more current timely messages to applicants and licensees. It's very low numbers right now. I would like to see a much more robust social media presence.

### **Inconsistent Messaging**

1. Room for improvement with a more consistent message that the Board delivers. We have Board members who are liaisons to various groups to communicate the mission of the Board, but I see an inconsistency in Board members communicating the message. I'm not sure if the Board members have a comprehensive understanding of what the Board does in order to have a consistent message to communicate. (Various interpretations of what the Board is doing are being disseminated.)

### **Remaining Proactive**

1. Staying on top of the new architecture trends and making sure licensees are too.

## **Board Leadership: Public and Professional Awareness Weaknesses**

### **Need to be More Proactive**

1. We could do more. Technology changes so quickly it can be hard to stay up to date, we could always improve in that area so that consumers don't find out about us after a problem, that we are more proactive. Kind of like the CSLB, consumers didn't always know about that Board either, but now they do.

### **Measuring Success**

1. It's always difficult to measure how you're doing in your outreach efforts, to know if we are spending our resources in the right manner.

## **Staff: Public and Professional Awareness Weaknesses**

### **Confusing Information**

1. Information provided by NCARB and the Board on the two websites can overwhelm candidates based on their recent education, foreign experience, or veteran experience. No one situation is easy to determine or follow without telephone or email help provided directly by the Board.
2. Also, the building design limitations document has not been updated in nearly 15 years.

### **Need for More Outreach**

1. I believe we need to provide greater outreach and to utilize the social media platforms of the Board.
2. There is not enough information out there about the Board - who we are and what we do. Many aspiring architects do not know the difference or relationships between the Board, NCARB, AIA, and Division of the State Architect.

### **Public Education**

1. Not enough information is provided to the public that the Board exists. Frequently, candidates assume that the Board is a sub-entity of NCARB and not that it's a completely different entity.
2. Very little public interaction; social media weak
3. Press releases for public benefit are infrequent. Communication of the Board's role and responsibility to the public overall is lacking.

### **Stakeholders: Organizational Relationships Strengths**

#### **Strong Association Relationships**

1. There seems to be a solid relationship with AIACC.
2. Very good NCARB relationship ... AIACC too.

### **Board Members: Organizational Relationships Strengths**

#### **Board Member Involvement**

3. We've been able to travel and be part of the national conversation. We have Board members that participate on the national board.

#### **Success in Building Relationships**

1. The relationship with NCARB. Relationship with AIA are strengths, they always have presence at all of our meetings. (2)
2. Relationship with NCARB is very positive and very strong, improved vastly over the years. AIA comes to our Board meetings often.
3. The strength with AIA California council, they attend and have representation at our Board meetings. There's a healthy exchange of the initiative's they are proposing and following up on and how that impacts the CAB.
4. The professional/architectural relationship bodies, we have good interaction with and also with sister agencies, engineers board, CSLB, that helps them interact with architect profession.
5. We have good respect and cooperative interaction with related organizations, AIA, NCARB, even when we disagree.
6. We've been effective in assisting/collaborate with schools to take on the new licensure upon graduation program (IPAL).
7. We oversee LATC, have communication with contractors, NCARB, and at Board meetings, there have been people from interior design. So we have relationships with a diverse group of people and with colleges/universities. Overall, our Board has pretty good relationships and partnerships. The ones that we do deal with, we do a good job with.

## **Board Leadership: Organizational Relationships Strengths**

### **Strong Relationships**

1. The Board does a really good job of partnering with stakeholder related organizations. We have a very good relationship with industry groups and the associations, they are there for the meetings and assist Board members in the discussions. The associations are responsive to the Board concerns and what we are looking for.
2. Our relationship with NCARB is the strongest it's been, we have a really good relationship with their members, board, and executive staff.

## **Staff: Organizational Relationships Strengths**

### **Professional Organization Relationships**

1. The Board has developed strong relationships with key collateral organizations.
2. The Board works one-on-one with NCARB to ensure instructions and data integrity with candidate records is maintained.

### **Good Communication**

1. The Board attempts to reach out to multiple NGOs to receive their input on the changes to the profession.
2. Open communication and meetings with related organizations.

## **Stakeholders: Organizational Relationships Weaknesses**

### **Focus on Related Organizations**

1. Lack of email blasts to building departments.
2. Need to do more work with schools, although that is very labor intensive.

### **Limited Focus**

1. The related organizations the Board appears to reach out to is overly limited (usually focused on AIA).

### **Weakening Relationships**

1. Could be more pro-active with AIA collaboration and communications.
2. It appears that the Board's hard-fought battle to strengthen relationships with NCARB, NAAB, etc. have begun to weaken. Please prevent any further degradation.

### **General**

1. I cannot point to specifics; maybe that means there is a weakness here?

## Board Members: Organizational Relationships Weaknesses

### Staffing

1. Not having the bandwidth to do more, like for staff to do more and build more relationships and be more engaged in events.

### External Relationships

1. Outside of NCARB I don't see any other relationships with other organizations on that level. Why don't we have a strong relationship with Contractor's Board? It's good to know what related professions are doing.
2. Outside of AIA, there isn't a lot of involvement with any other collateral organizations, there needs to be a better connection with those other organizations.
3. We had a program to reach out to the educators in the state, but it didn't really work because they didn't want to hear from us annually, it was a nice idea but was more of a one-way conversation and it didn't gain anyone anything. We've moved away from doing the liaison program and moved it back to the staff and I think that's the right place for it.
4. I would like to see improvement in communication with structural engineers, mechanical engineers, and other engineering groups. Perhaps we have this, but from what I can tell, we should see more relationships/rapport in this area.
5. Some contact with landscapers and contractors could do a lot more with inter-board relationships -engineers, contractors, see what each board is doing and their role of those boards.

### Access

1. I would like to re-institute, going to the colleges and universities for each meeting (SF/Bay Area, SoCal, San Diego) in the spring, summer, and fall. We can do rotations, not going to the same school every year. It would be especially good to go to those doing the IPAL program, so we could meet the students.

### School Buy-in

1. Ability to move the schools in terms of IPAL is somewhat limited but it's a new project so it will take some time.

### Suggestions for Improvement

1. Possibly have reps from other boards to talk about strengths and weaknesses between professions and understand their roles. Reduce animosity between contractor licensees and architect licensees. The more the boards work together and the more correspondence among the boards and our activities — that could filter down into the licensees to improve relationships between licensees among the various related professions.

2. We could partner up with the universities who have television education to do our public service announcements, do some more out of the box thinking to get our message out there.

## **Board Leadership: Organizational Relationships Weaknesses**

### **National Presence**

1. Being able to participate with the organizations, especially when we are in a banned state and we can't travel. We are trying to build a strong relationship with the national organization, but we may not always be able to participate, we can't always have a voice when we have the 5<sup>th</sup> largest licensee population.

## **Staff: Organizational Relationships Weaknesses**

### **External Influence/Preferential Treatment**

1. AIA has too much influence on the Board.
2. Some organizations or suborganizations of AIA receive preferential treatment even when facts of an issue may indicate that a candidate or licensee is incorrect in their assumption/issue(s).
3. The Board seems to do more for the AIA than any other organization - in responding to requests made, working with the organization, and response times.

### **Limited Focus on Relationship Building**

1. There are so many relationships the Board could build, but doesn't. For example, it would be nice for the Board to collaborate with other non healing arts boards to discuss best practices. Additionally, collaborating with NCARB, AIACC, and AIA Emerging Professionals could be a great benefit to build consumer awareness of the Architects Board.

### **Outdated Technology**

1. The Board has had to work with antiquated (20+ year old) SAP database that requires intensive manhour (labor) to maintain and reconcile with national NCARB candidate records.

### **Suggested Objectives**

1. Participate more with outside organizations, especially NCARB (if possible, participate with their California meetings). In less related areas, work with CalVet for services for veterans, the CCCC for coordination with community colleges, NAAB schools for information to their students/faculty, and work with local NGOs for ways to improve/enhance the Board's purpose.
2. Work more with collateral organizations - participate when possible in their meetings and have more direct dialogue.

## **Stakeholders: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Strengths**

### **Staff**

1. Good metrics, effective planning process and staff follow-through

### **Customer Oriented**

1. CAB appears to be "customer-oriented" through outreach and a general sense of being approachable.

## **Board Members: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Strengths**

### **Professional Development**

1. I'm very supportive of staff having the ability to go to training and do the professional development if they want to grow or learn something new.

### **Good Customer Service**

1. We have a survey that allows people to provide feedback, it was generally positive.

### **Staff and Leadership**

1. Based on the material presented to the Board, it seems the staff is effective at handling enforcement, licensing, I haven't heard of any problems.
2. Maybe they are doing a good job because we don't hear about it much.
3. It's run efficiently and effectively, we lost our long-time EO so we have a new EO but it's too soon to tell if anything will change in that regard, don't have any reason to believe it will change negatively.
4. I like the way it's all organized, everyone has a very clear idea of what their jobs are. They do a lot with the staff they have. They are extremely capable and do things in a timely manner.
5. The staff is competent, and we don't have long open claims, things get dealt with in a reasonable amount of time. Our staff is very responsive.
6. Staff is phenomenal. The information they provide us makes our jobs so much easier.
7. We have good legal counsel who keeps the Board on track and explains things thoroughly. (2)
8. Staff is amazing. Staff makes our job really easy. Meeting notes are really great! Detailed. If we ask staff to do something they do it quickly. The staff is wonderful. Professional, friendly, if we ask and they get right on it.

### **Board Members**

1. I see this current Board as one the best functioning boards I've been on in a long time. I'm always pleased to go to our meetings because I think my fellow members work collegially with each other and are extremely knowledgeable. It's a delight to be on the Board.

### **Serving Stakeholders**

1. We serve stakeholders pretty well in terms of expanding opportunities without weakening standards and providing appropriate disciplinary actions when necessary.
2. The Board wants to see the retesting period dropped from the 6 months, staff is finally in the process of dropping that timeframe, they are trying to get the tests refreshed quicker, so applicants can retest.

## **Board Leadership: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Strengths**

### **Staff**

1. The Board has really good customer service. The architect consultants and the calls they take and the information they provide to any interested party. All of the staff are hardworking and very knowledgeable, many have been there a long time.

### **Good Customer Service**

1. Our customer service is very good, I think transitioning to our new leadership has been pretty effective. We anticipate sunset review will go smoothly.

## **Staff: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Strengths**

### **Collaborative Staff**

1. Efficiencies could be realized in manner management conveys input to staff regarding assignments.
2. Various staff members work with one another to accomplish the goals of the organization, even if the items are not directly related to their unit. This has helped when major projects come along or issues that come up. In general, staff are good to work with and issues tend to be resolved fairly quickly.
3. Each unit within the Board has clear direction on what their work should entail. Cross training units has allowed the Board to maintain flow when staff are absent.

### **Customer Oriented**

1. Each unit does a great job to provide excellent customer service to candidates and licensees.
2. Candidates for ARE and eventual licensure receive prompt responses to their questions as can be provided.

## **Stakeholders: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Weaknesses**

### **Board's Focus**

1. It is not clear who the Board's 'customers' really are. There appears to be too much focus on licensure candidates treating them as though they are children rather than adults wanting to qualify in a life long professional practice.

### **Technology**

1. Need to be more digital

## **Board Members: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Weaknesses**

### **Staffing**

1. I'd like to see one more staff added, I think they could be much more effective with social media. Develop a better approach to communication.
2. They've had some turnover and had to hire and train some new people, it doesn't need to be addressed, it's already being addressed.

### **Technology**

1. The computer system of the state and the BreEZe system that gets delayed and changed, we'd like to make it easier to provide customer service, broadly defined so getting that up to speed is a challenge we need to overcome shortly.
2. For some reason we still can't take online payments, but apparently CAB can now start looking for other systems instead of BreEZe. I'm hoping with our new EO, would love to see if she can light a fire.

### **Board Member Orientation**

1. When new members come on, maybe more information/introduction would be helpful about what the Board is all about. This helps navigate those first Board meetings, some background would have been helpful.

## **Board Leadership: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Weaknesses**

### **Technology Improvements**

1. The Board will be going through the OCM process and looking at different IT options to make us more effective. We are looking at new opportunities not just the way we are doing things now. We've been doing things the same way for a long time, but I think there are ways to do things to make it easier for people without giving up the quality so just trying to make the process easier and more efficient.

2. We've been trying to transition to this new platform with the Department and we are in the last group and that's been a challenge. That's been hanging over us for so many years it would be good to figure out what platform we are going to use and move forward with it. We don't have any online services or credit card payments, for customer service our IT is not up to date, we are behind the times.

### **Staffing**

1. If we had more resources we could hire more staff to do some of the outreach that we need in terms of consumer education and student education, we would like to go to high schools and colleges to get people excited about the profession.

## **Staff: Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service Weaknesses**

### **Leadership Inefficiencies**

1. Management often creates unnecessary complexity when addressing even simple matters.
2. I believe there is a lack of communication at the Board. Management lacks communication skills with staff that are doing the detailed work. It would be nice to be able to view or participate in Board and committee meetings to have a better understanding of what is going on in the Board. Communication across the Board is severely lacking.
3. Lack of coherence among management levels which results in a lack of clear direction to staff regarding assignments. Staff are not trusted by senior management to perform duties.

### **Staffing**

1. Enforcement areas for customer response appear to be overwhelmed with insufficient staff to manage the various details.

### **No Teamwork**

1. Not every staff member is helping the Board achieve its goals or they do not act as a team player. Some staff are absent frequently, while others are gone during their deadlines, leaving projects (and their deadline) to other staff, which has impacted other critical projects. Certain staff tend to also spend a significant time away from their desk when they are in the office or they spend a large chunk of time on their phone/computer on non-work-related items. Constant revisions to documents cause delays in providing information to the Board's shareholders. Some individuals also provide assignments to staff over the weekend, with a quick turnaround deadline...this typically would not be an issue, however, the individual who assigns the items typically has had several weeks they could have provided to staff instead of pressuring them to tight deadlines.
2. Some staff are frequently absent which has resulted in others taking on additional work to meet deadlines. Constant revisions to documents has caused delays in their release

to candidates, licensees, and the public. Office is more reactionary to issues that arise, rather than proactive in heading them off.

**Outdated Technology**

1. Lack of web-based software to stay innovative in the technology changing and creative world of architecture. Students are using innovative materials and software applications and the Board is still receiving license renewals and complaints in antiquated formats.

**Suggested Objectives**

1. There are very knowledgeable staff whose input as a resource not often consulted.

## Appendix B – Opportunities and Threats

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to the Board’s Opportunities and Threats. Responses were provided via Board leadership and Board staff from their respective focus groups and Board member interviews. Though stakeholders were given opportunity to respond in the stakeholder survey, no responses were provided.

The comments related to Opportunities and Threats were grouped into the following categories:

- Professional or Industry Practice
- Technology
- Educational Standards/Education
- Politics and Outreach
- Economics
- Other

*The comments in this appendix are shown as provided by stakeholders. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. Some comments may have been edited for grammar or punctuation; however, edits to the comments have not changed the meaning the stakeholder intended when providing the comment.*

## Professional or Industry Practice:

### Opportunities

#### Board Members:

##### Trends

1. We have to establish some sort of CE before it ends up being dictated to the Board through the Legislature. We need to pay attention to and establish criteria for.
2. The environment of testing is undergoing a change, we are in the middle of that to see how it turns out and hopefully it will be positive, but we have to wait and see.
3. Focus on having as many people as possible working, encourage people to work and then if there's a recession that's when they can go back to school. Right now, not enough people in the workforce, it's hard to hire, there are not enough good people to work right there.
4. We might have a void in 10-20 years, we have a lot of international students that are going back home after they graduate so all of that knowledge is leaving the country. Colleges are taking international students over the U.S. students because they can collect more tuition.

#### Board Leadership:

##### Pathways to Licensure

1. The IPAL program, it's fairly new but they will start getting data on the effectiveness, it's a good opportunity for the Board, I think we should continue to support it.

#### Board Staff:

##### Examinations

1. Transitions in ARE versions, which cause the Board to spend funds on upgrading its examination history.

## Threats

### Stakeholders:

#### Potential Licensees

1. Changing interested professional's mind about becoming a licensed practitioner and pursue other routes.
2. Time-to-licensure remains an issue with students and interns, threatening the supply of architects to fill positions of responsibility in the field.

#### External Pressures

1. NCARB seeking to take over everything, interior designers, not being able to keep up with technology due to state requirements.

### Board Members:

#### Unlicensed Practice

1. A big threat to what the Board does is unlicensed practice. Keeping an eye on that and having architects up to speed on the profession.

#### External Requirements

1. 6 years back, architects were required to have 5 hours of educational credits in issues dealing with ADA, now, we have to do that as part of our licensure. Now we've switched to energy sustainability. I'm concerned about outside entities placing these extra requirements on architects when there are already laws and requirements that they need to abide by anyway. We need to be really aware of these outside entities come in a place extra licensure requirements and ongoing education requirements without really considering why they should be there.

#### Not Enough Licensees

1. Not having enough licensees in the next 3 or 4 years. Professional has become more and more complicated and needs new licenses.

## Laws & Regulations

### Threats

### Board Members:

#### Environmental Regulations

1. Environmental regulations across the state that are the same – architects need to get more involved because CA has many different environments – same energy standards in death valley, vs. mountains, vs. coast. Board should discuss regulatory issues as they come down our way.

# Educational Standards/ Education

## Opportunities

### Board Members:

#### **Applicant and Licensee Education**

1. The Board needs to try to keep a balance between formal education and education out in the field. We need to make sure there's a balance here. We need to make sure that universities/education providers and professionals overseeing work experience are working together to make sure candidates are adequately trained and licensed. For instance, some firms aren't allowing students to utilize what they learned in schools. We the Board should reinforce what we see in the field and how the universities can match this.

# National and State Politics

## Threats

### Board Members:

#### **Deregulation**

1. Deregulation, and paying attention to that. So far California is doing ok, nothing against us, no potential policy change coming so far, but we don't know about this national movement if that will trigger something here. Maybe the Board should take a more proactive role to observe all of the development regarding the deregulations; therefore, we have a more informed mindset if the issue arises. Maybe we should invite an expert every year or every 6 months to have a talk about the deregulation---it's become almost a movement. How do we think ahead?

#### **Change in Governor**

1. I am curious to see how the new Governor will differ from Governor Brown. I'm hopeful the policies will remain as innovative and as environmentally friendly as they are now and architects take the lead on green projects. I'm looking forward to having a good outcome where we can stay with our positive leadership.

# Economy

## Threats

### Board Leadership:

#### **Loss of Funding**

1. I think about how change in economy would impact the finances of the Board.

2. Budgeting is always a threat, you never know for sure how that's going to go.

### **Downturn in the Economy**

1. Everyone says we are good for a couple more years, economy-wise, but after that no one knows. I don't think we have too much to worry about in terms of everyone's business until 2020, but the economy is the most impactful thing to an architect and whether they have a job. Hopefully we can get some indication sooner than later.
2. There's a risk that the IPAL program fails in a recession because it's reliant on firms to hire students.
3. The early path to licensure dependent on internships. If the economy dives, it could be tough to find internships. Proactively plan for the next economic downturn. What would be the alternative in a downturn in an economic downturn?

## **Threats**

### **Board Leadership:**

#### **Sunset review**

1. There is a movement to look at the number of professions and licenses that are required and deregulated some, take the opportunity to make sure we educate the legislators about the importance of licensure and what we're here for and why we were created in the first place.

## Appendix C – Data Collection Method

Information for this environmental scan was gathered from stakeholders, Board members, the EO and Board managers (Board leadership), and staff using the following methods:

- ◆ Interviews conducted with nine Board members, the Executive Officer, and the Assistant Executive Officer completed during the months of October and November 2018.
- ◆ Online survey sent to a list of Board stakeholders which remained open between October 5, 2018 and November 5, 2018 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an external perspective. Forty-four stakeholders took the survey. The below table shows how stakeholders identified themselves in the online survey.

Stakeholders Breakdown	Number	% of Total
I am an architect	10	23%
I am from an association affiliated with the Board	1	2%
I represent an academic institution	2	4.5%
I represent a government agency	2	4.5%
I am an employee at the Board	25	57%
Other	4	9%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>



SOLID Planning Solutions is dedicated to your continual improvement and organization development.  
We offer a wide array of services and programs to Boards, Bureaus and Divisions.

Strategic Planning • Process Improvement • Planning Sessions • Meeting Facilitation  
Contact us to learn more about how we can help your organization achieve a successful future.  
916-574-8316 • [SOLID@dca.ca.gov](mailto:SOLID@dca.ca.gov)